

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10-12, 15-17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vlodavsky et al. (US 2003/0161327) in view of Liu et al. (US 5,530,703) and Tomaru et al. (US 7,003,710). Applicant's respectfully traverse this rejection because the cited references, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the claimed features for receiving a serial advanced technology attachment (SATA) frame. The references also do not disclose or suggest determining whether a reception error requires a retry for requiring retransmission of a SATA frame, as also recited in the claims.

As amended, the claims recite the features specifically directed to a serial advanced technology attachment, which is a storage interface standard for storage devices such as hard disk drives. Upon occurrence of an reception error that there is no information in a attribute registering unit corresponding to the information acquired by the attribute acquiring unit, a determination is made as to whether the reception error requires a retry for requiring retransmission of a SATA frame, and perform the retry when the reception error requires the retry.

The references cited in the Office Action generally relate to computer networking systems such as local area network (LAN) technology and transmission of broadcast and multicast packets. The references also relate to the protocol for a packet-based computer network. None of the cited references are directed to a storage interface standard employed in hard disk drives, specifically, serial ATA. Accordingly, the references do not

disclose a particular type of storage device interface, specifically, the serial ATA interface, as expressly recited in the claims. For this reason alone, the claims are believed to be allowable over the cited references.

Moreover, while the Tomaru reference is cited for disclosing the feature of the invention for determining whether the reception error requires a retry for requiring retransmission of packets (as previously recited prior to the current claim amendments), Tomaru merely discloses retransmitting individual blocks of a packet when an error exists in the blocks instead of retransmitting the entire packet. As clearly shown in Fig. 1, Tomaru teaches that when an error exists in a packet, the block containing the error is automatically retransmitted in another subsequent packet. Tomaru does not disclose determining whether the error in the block requires a retransmission. Therefore, the suggested combination would still lack the ability to determine between a reception error that requires that a retry for requiring retransmission of a packet and a reception error that does not. More importantly, the suggested combination would still lack the ability to determine between a reception error that requires that a retry for requiring retransmission of a SATA frame. For this reason also, the claims are believed to be allowable.

Claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, 14, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vlodavsky et al. in view of Liu et al. (US 5,530,703) and Tomaru et al. (US 7,003,710) and further in view of Gupta et al. or Ptasinski et al. These claims depend either from claims 1, 6 or 11 and are allowable for the reasons given with respect to their


independent claims, and because of the additional features that they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. The Examiner should contact Applicants' undersigned attorney if a telephone conference would expedite prosecution.

If a Petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for response is required to make the attached response timely, it is hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for response in the above-identified application for the period required to make the attached response timely. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge fees which may be required to this application under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 07-2069.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 
B. Joe Kim
Registration No. 41,895

August 28, 2009

Suite 2500
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978
P:\DOCS\1924\69647\F05340.DOC